

Subject: Re: Final Revisions WTC BID Renewal
From: Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>
Date: 05/05/2011 11:42 AM
To: Donald Duckworth <duckworth.donald@gmail.com>
CC: Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>, Paul Makowski <paul.makowski@lacity.org>

Don,
Good news: database looks good, numbers in MDP look good, just one typo in ER Govt list.

In % column for 4122-023-917 it should read 0.52%, not 0.052

Other than that, the numbers look good in this version.

On Wed, May 4, 2011 at 12:17 PM, Donald Duckworth <duckworth.donald@gmail.com> wrote:

Thanks Dennis. These are great comments. Please see my notes below:

Re 1). I have combined the previously separate Xcell files into one file separated by tabs.

Re 2). \$302,175 is the correct number. I've fixed this rounding problem.

Re 3). I've fixed the benefit unit calculation.

Re 4). I've fixed the typo.

Re 5). I've fixed the rounding error per the above.

I've checked all the docs for consistency and made any needed changes.

Attached are originals of all the documents labeled "110431," even if April only has 30 days!

On Tue, May 3, 2011 at 1:04 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Don,

I found some issues with your documents. Remember that on the MDP/ER I'm only looking at numbers, not text. Any text/wording issues will be addressed by Paul or Rick.

Biggest issue:

1) On your "MDP" copy of the data, the one with the "MDP List" & "Main Database" tabs, you need to trash the Main Database tab so that you don't accidentally use it for anything. That is a completely outdated version that needs to be replaced by the "ER" copy of the data.

On the "ER" version, this data is mostly good, except:

2) Cell C150, you have typed in \$302,175 as the BID budget, and this is used to calculate the rates. The actual assessment total calculated is \$302,144.78

3) For parcel [4122-024-918](#) the lot benefit unit is 31,494 (typed in). I know that per the MDP the benefit unit for parks is 81%, since there is no formula in the cell, it calculates out to 80.6298% Was it intended this way?

In the MDP:

4) Page 16, 2nd paragraph: text reads \$0.0609, \$0.0304, \$7.5626 & \$3.7813 for various rates which don't correspond to any of the rates in the data or elsewhere in the documents.

In the ER:

5) Page 2-12 5th paragraph: text reads \$302,175 for the total cost of services in 2012. Actual calculated total from the data is \$302,144.78

On Sat, Apr 30, 2011 at 4:14 PM, Donald Duckworth
<duckworth.donald@gmail.com> wrote:

I hereby resolve to never ever send another document until Dennis has reviewed the data sheet first, no matter how great the time pressure!! (Furthermore, tonight I will sleep on an ant hill in the back yard!)

Re 1):

I can explain. I made a mistake and forgot to update the "MDP" list as I had the "ER" list with the new data you had given me. My son would be advocating "half-credit;" any chance?

The 2 lists came about as a result of the 1st set of City Clerk comments. The "MDP" list is Appendix 1 of the MDP; the "ER" list attaches to the ER.

Both lists have now been properly updated and are hereby re-re-submitted with the changed date index "110430."

Re 2):

The addition of the new parcel came about as a result of the 2nd set of City Clerk comments. Since this re-submittal is the result of that April 5 meeting, you're right, this is the first time it's been included in the documents that you have seen. I believe that the parcel has been correctly included in both the "MDP" and the "ER" data (#120). I will always defer to your records as to the accuracy of the street frontage figure upon which the parcel is assessed; the figure included was provided by Keyser Marston's mapping group. A full justification of the assessment methodology is provided in the MDP & ER documents. The "ER" spreadsheet generates assessments that, I believe, subject to your review and approval, are exactly as shown in the documents.

I hope this gets me out of your "dog house" Dennis. Thanks for catching my error so quickly.

On Fri, Apr 29, 2011 at 2:17 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Don,

I have a few issues with the latest documents:

1) Why does the "ER" data differ from the "MDP" data that you sent? Why are there two versions? One doesn't include

any of the ownership/address revisions that I had sent you. Your "MDP list" has all of the old outdated information.

2) What is this new parcel [4122-023-917](#)? This has not been on any previous version of the database or map that I have seen. It's still not in the data, only on your "MDP" parcel/owner list, and on your map. How are you coming up with an assessment amount if it's not in the database? In any case, the frontage & lot size have not been reviewed for this parcel.

Please advise.

On Fri, Apr 29, 2011 at 12:25 PM, Donald Duckworth

<duckworth.donald@gmail.com> wrote:

Here at the final WTC revisions. Let me know as I can assist in any way. Thank you.

--

Dennis Rader
Technical Research Supervisor
[213-978-1120](tel:213-978-1120)

--

Dennis Rader
Technical Research Supervisor
[213-978-1120](tel:213-978-1120)

--

Dennis Rader
Technical Research Supervisor
213-978-1120